# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

, for	the
Western Distric	of Wisconsin
JOHN DOE 52  v.  Mayo Clinic Health System - Eau Claire Clnic, Inc., David A. Van de Loo, MD, et al.	Case No.: 14-CV-387
BILL O	COSTS
Judgment having been entered in the above entitled action on	04/07/2015 against plaintiff ,
the Clerk is requested to tax the following as costs:	Date
Fees of the Clerk	<b>\$</b>
Fees for service of summons and subpoena	
Fees for printed or electronically recorded transcripts necessarily of	btained for use in the case 4,267.68
Fees and disbursements for printing	
Fees for witnesses (itemize on page two)	0.00
Fees for exemplification and the costs of making copies of any mannecessarily obtained for use in the case	
Docket fees under 28 U.S.C. 1923	
Costs as shown on Mandate of Court of Appeals	
Compensation of court-appointed experts	·····
Compensation of interpreters and costs of special interpretation se	vices under 28 U.S.C. 1828
Other costs (please itemize)	
• .	TOTAL \$4,322.58
SPECIAL NOTE: Attach to your bill an itemization and documen	ation for requested costs in all categories.
Decla	ration
services for which fees have been charged were actually and neces in the following manner:	are correct and were necessarily incurred in this action and that the sarily performed. A copy of this bill has been served on all parties a mail, postage prepaid
Name of Attorney: Guy DuBeau	
For: Mayo Clinic Health System - Eau Claire Name of Claiming Party	Clinic, Inc. Date: 04/07/2015
	of Costs
Costs are taxed in the amount of \$4,322,58	and included in the judgment.
Fotor Oppener By:	Deputy Clerk 5/26/15 Date

AO 133 (Rev. 12/09) Bill of Costs

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Witness Fees (computation, cf. 28 U.S.C. 1821 for statutory fees)								
	ATTENDANCE		SUBSISTENCE		MILEAGE		Total Cost	
NAME, CITY AND STATE OF RESIDENCE	Days	Total Cost	Days	Total Cost	Miles	Total Cost	Each Witness	
							\$0.00	
							\$0.00	
							\$0.00	
							\$0.00	
							\$0.00	
							\$0.00	
					TOTAL		\$0.00	

#### NOTICE

#### Section 1924, Title 28, U.S. Code (effective September 1, 1948) provides:

"Sec. 1924. Verification of bill of costs."

"Before any bill of costs is taxed, the party claiming any item of cost or disbursement shall attach thereto an affidavit, made by himself or by his duly authorized attorney or agent having knowledge of the facts, that such item is correct and has been necessarily incurred in the case and that the services for which fees have been charged were actually and necessarily performed."

#### See also Section 1920 of Title 28, which reads in part as follows:

"A bill of costs shall be filed in the case and, upon allowance, included in the judgment or decree."

# The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure contain the following provisions: RULE 54(d)(1)

Costs Other than Attorneys' Fees.

Unless a federal statute, these rules, or a court order provides otherwise, costs — other than attorney's fees — should be allowed to the prevailing party. But costs against the United States, its officers, and its agencies may be imposed only to the extent allowed by law. The clerk may tax costs on 14 day's notice. On motion served within the next 7 days, the court may review the clerk's action.

#### RULE 6

(d) Additional Time After Certain Kinds of Service.

When a party may or must act within a specified time after service and service is made under Rule 5(b)(2)(C), (D), (E), or (F), 3 days are added after the period would otherwise expire under Rule 6(a).

### **RULE 58(e)**

Cost or Fee Awards:

Ordinarily, the entry of judgment may not be delayed, nor the time for appeal extended, in order to tax costs or award fees. But if a timely motion for attorney's fees is made under Rule 54(d)(2), the court may act before a notice of appeal has been filed and become effective to order that the motion have the same effect under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a)(4) as a timely motion under Rule 59.

John Doe 52 v. Mayo Clinic Health System-Eau Claire Clinic, Inc. et al 14-cv-387-wmc

### NOTES TO CLERK'S TAXATION OF COSTS

Plaintiff's main objection to the Bill of Costs is that defendants should have simply waited on a ruling on their motion to dismiss. However, discovery was not stayed pending the Court's ruling on the motion. It is unreasonable to expect counsel to stop obtaining discovery to defend their client due to a pending motion. More than half of the depositions were noticed by plaintiff. Obviously, no party was confident that the Court's ruling would be in their favor. The Court set specific discovery deadlines that parties were expected to meet. Continuing to obtain discovery by ordering deposition transcripts was reasonable and therefore recoverable under 28 U.S.C. § 1920. The costs requested are reasonable and plaintiff's objections are overruled.